See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281593907

Evaluation of Smooth Pursuit in Individuals with Central Field Loss

Poster · August 2015

CITATIONS 0	5	READS 37	
4 authors, including:			
Q	Natela Shanidze Smith-Kettlewell Eye Research Institute	Q	Preeti Verghese Smith-Kettlewell Eye Research Institute
	SEE PROFILE		SEE PROFILE



Evaluation of Smooth Pursuit in Individuals with Central Field Loss

Natela Shanidze¹, Elena Potapchuk¹, Stephen Heinen¹, & Preeti Verghese¹ ¹Smith-Kettlewell Eye Research Institute, San Francisco, CA, USA

Introduction

- Smooth pursuit eye movements are traditionally tied to the fovea.
- Little is known about pursuit with central field loss (CFL).
- CFL is often associated with the loss of the fovea, eccentric viewing, & loss of binocular vision.

Methods

• Participants: 7 CFL patients, ages 57-91; 2 Controls, ages: 70, 85. • Task: pursuit of a 1° spot, step ramp paradigm (Rashbass 1961) • 6 directions (0°, 90°, 135°, 180°, 270°, 315°) at 5, 10 & 15 °/s.

Gain Does Not Improve in Binocular vs. **Monocular Pursuit**



Binocular pursuit gain versus monocular pursuit gain of the corresponding viewing eye. There was no difference in pursuit gains for patients or controls (Mann-Whitney U Test, p>0.2). Symbols represent individual patients, black dashed line: identity line. Gains for all velocities and directions are plotted.

- Experiments repeated with binocular & monocular viewing
- Eye movements of both eyes were always recorded (EyeLink).
- Velocity gains & error (deviation of eye position from the target direction) were used to quantify pursuit.

Eye Velocity & Postion During Binocular Smooth Pursuit of a 10°/s Target





Position Errors for Patient and Control Pursuit Targets at 5°/s



Top row: position errors for a patient (P6) with non-overlapping scotomas. Error is greatest for the non-viewing right eye and is lowest during binocular pursuit. Bottom row: position errors for a control participant. Errors are comparable across viewing conditions and significantly lower than the patient's (note difference in y-axis scales).

Example velocity & position traces (patient P1). Dashed blue line: target; thick black line: average eye velocity. Different colors denote individual trials.

Gain Varies Across Trajectories for Binocular & Monocular Pursuit

LEFT EYE

RIGHT EYE

To compute error, position data were fit with a line of the the same slope as the target



Position Error Differs Between Monocular & Binocular Pursuit in Patients



Monocular & binocular error differed for patients with non-overlapping scotomas, but not for controls or patients with binocular scotomas, Mann-Whitney U Test, p<0.05 (P3, P5-P7).



Inset: axes magnified for clarity.



Summary of average gains of 10°/s trials, for all directions for patient in Figure 1. Gains vary across directions, consistent with the patient's scotoma location (upper right visual field) and are similar for binocular & monocular pursuit with the viewing and non-viewing eyes. Left pane: data recorded from the left eye: right pane: right eye. First legend letter: viewing condition (Both, Left, Right Eyes).



Summary & Conclusions

- Gains in patients were abnormal (0.00-3.77) and varied with target direction.
- Patients exhibited more error between target and eye position than healthy controls.
- Binocular viewing reduced error only for patients with non-overlapping scotomas, but did not affect gain overall.

Reference: 1. Rashbass, C. (1961). The relationship between saccadic and smooth tracking eye movements. The Journal of Physiology, 159, 326-338.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by: NIH grant F32 EY025151 and Rachel C. Atkinson Postdoctoral Fellowship to Natela Shanidze & NIH grant R01 EY022394 to Preeti Verghese